

Atty's 22725

Pat. App. 10/766,513

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay. The examiner has indicated that the case contains allowable subject matter.

The priority papers were filed with the original application papers and their receipt was acknowledged in the above-mentioned Examiner's Action. The undersigned hereby reiterates the priority claim made in the earlier-filed Declaration.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors. No new matter whatsoever has been added.

Enclosed herewith are proposed formal drawings.

The undersigned is familiar with the recommendations of 37 CFR 1.77(b). However, in the thousands of patent applications the undersigned has prepared in the last thirty-some years, there has never been an instance when headings c through e were needed, so adding this surplusage would have been a waste of time, paper, and ink. Furthermore the summary of the invention is frequently long brief, and the drawing frequently has only one view, so these headings are often inaccurate. Thus the recommendations of 37 CFR 1.77(b) have not been followed.

Atty's 22725

Pat. App. 10/766,513

The objection to claim 5 for failure to illustrate has been mooted by cancellation of this claim.

Claim 4, which originally depended directly from independent claim 1, has been found to contain allowable subject matter. New claim 16 includes all the limitations of original claims 1 and 4 so it is allowable.

In addition claim 12, which depended via claim 11 on independent claim 10, has been found to contain allowable subject matter. All the subject matter of claims 12 and 11 has been inserted into claim 10, and claims 11 and 12 have been canceled, making claim 10 and claims 13, 14, and 15 depending from claim 10 also allowable.

Independent method claim 1 has been amended to define the invention with somewhat greater particularity over the art, in particular over the teachings of US 4,113,522 of Hamilton. More particularly claim 1 now recites the transversely extending shoulders 6 and 7 and how the workpiece is compressed longitudinally so as to be extruded transversely. Nothing like this is seen in the art.

More particularly, Hamilton '522 shows a system where in every instance the workpiece is deformed transversely by a surface that moves transversely, not longitudinally. There is no suggestion here to compress the workpiece longitudinally so that it

Atty's 22725


Pat. App. 10/766,513

extrudes transversely, much less while holding it between two parallel longitudinally extending surfaces. Thus amended claim 1 is allowable over Hamilton '522 under both \$102 and \$103.

All of the claims in the case are therefore in condition for allowance.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.

  
by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597  
Attorney for Applicant

08 December 2005  
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900  
Bronx, NY 10471-0900  
Cust. No.: 535  
Tel: (718) 884-6600  
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure:                      Formal drawing.